

Thesis: The modification of older terror drills into a real-world scenario. Participation of secret flights in terror drills/war games. Evidence of duplicated flights to fulfill scenario. One of the duplicated flights is secret and broadcasts as a different flight #. This is supported by the fact that several flights which were claimed to have been hijacked were still held at the gate. Flights participating in military exercises have permission to change transponder code and flight # as desired; they are not the actual civilian airliners themselves.

Common objections:

- ◆ How could the drone flights remain invisible until after the plane swap? No duplicated planes tracked by ATC? Several flights broadcast as different flight #s.
- ◆ ACARS data shows that planes still airborne after official crashes; this indicates secret flights.

Descriptions based on imagination vs. an argument based on fact. This is not meant to convince people, but simply to put forward a scenario that explains the air traffic confusion and delayed military response, in a way that makes sense and can be demonstrated in principle via public FAA & governmental records. Limited speculation and extensive reliance on official records and 911Myths (excellent research on debunking common misconceptions). Note speculation where needed. Present the information in a format that flows with the thesis. Always cross-reference and cite extensively to original source.

Guidelines for documentation:

- Every claim has chain of information, document original source where possible
- Acknowledge a specific interpretation of original source, consistent with supporting evidence from related sources
- Citations are so that others can fact-check claims (i.e. does the source say what the person claims the source says). This is the purpose of citation. Cite appropriate source where possible.
- Note facts and speculation where possible
- Isolated report or independent confirmation; was report retracted, updated.
- Insert complete direct quotes with appropriate context. *[e.g. "I stopped being a coroner after about 20 minutes..." He had just begun his search, and later efforts recovered human remains].*
- Is important information missing *[e.g. ATC didn't notice problem with FL175 until 8:52 when contact was attempted, so 8:43 notification of NEADS is not possible].*
- Note and list implicit assumptions/inferences where possible relevant to the claim. Note misleading information where possible *[e.g. Towers were not designed to withstand 600 MPH+ 707 impact. But a study commissioned under Robertson concluded that the building was robust enough to withstand. They were designed to withstand 707 impacts at landing speed.]*
- Proper journalism supports a contradicting claim and refutes the allegations head on. It would give a fair accounting of the allegations and assess the evidence behind them. If it found the evidence lacking, it would say why, it would offer context, additional evidence, show why the supposed facts were wrong, etc. (9/11 Myths follows this guide pretty well)
- Argument pyramid has good basics on how to refute a claim

Green for direct quotation. Blue for independently confirmed facts. Red for inference. Dark blue for indirect attribution.

Many planes made emergency landings at airports. But particular flights did not fit the profile of regular civilian airliners; rather their behavior indicates planes participating in terror drills.

“What counts in [...] scientific concepts and theories is not the workability of an hypothesis concerning a particular phenomenon, but the entire network or matrix of ideas including this particular phenomenon and everything else with which it is connected. The test of correctness is not a single line of logic but rather the internal consistency of the whole network—one must be able to traverse the network in any direction and have things hang together without contradiction.” (p. 117).

Our hypothesis may not be strictly scientific, but it is not fair to call it entirely ad-hoc either.

The same plane with multiple call signs:

Delta 89/Delta 1898/United 1898/Flight 177

First connect the evidence from primary sources, and then suggest particular conclusions from that data (e.g. “Notice the similarities between the flight profile [Boeing 767 from Boston to LAX/LAS, East Coast to West, and the similar flights #s].)

Call sign|Delta 1989|Delta 89

:---:|:---:|:---:

Flight plan|Boston-Los Angeles|Boston-Las Vegas

Squawk code|1304|7112

Direction at 9:43|west-bound|south-west/south-bound

Transponder|Continuously working|Disabled at 9:44

||Delta 1989|Flight X

:---:|:---:|:---:

Landed|10:10|10:45

Evacuated|12:30|11:15

on-board|69|200

Into|FAA HQ|NASA/Glenn

Runway Location|Runway 18/36|Runway 28/10

Landmark|I-X Center|NASA/Glenn

Possibly started off as N612UA broadcast as Flight 177.

Clearly two different planes in Cleveland airport – 2nd plane is suspicious

Why was Delta 1989 considered a hijack?

When UA93 checks in pre-9:28, the message is clear and understandable. No background noise. 9:31 transmission (it is surmised that) the transmission has a different origin, possibly another plane flying parallel above or below Delta 1989 (the screams were

apparently coming from Delta 1989's position). No proper RDF logs available to determine the origin of the independent bomb claims. Controller is simply trying to find whether the calls originated from that aircraft (i.e. UA93). RDF ability might only be within flight service stations.

Cleveland Center monitors transmissions on multiple channels. There is only one frequency which all parties could participate in. The plane can't call on another company's frequency, etc. The 121.5 MHz "emergency" frequency is the guard frequency which is monitored by all aircraft and personnel.

Two possible anomalies:

Screams are transmitted on emergency frequency, but the hijacker transmissions are transmitted on the regular working frequency. No pilots of the hijacked flights are known to have dialed the 7500 squawk code, it is possible (but unlikely) they would have time to dial up 121.5. You cannot broadcast accidentally on the emergency frequency, you have to dial it up first and it's a particular radio you have to dial.

Given that hijackers would unlikely be familiar with proper radio telephony procedure for air traffic. Genuine transmissions would overlap other communications on the regular frequency. But the hijacker messages are spliced nicely in between other radio communications. This could happen once, but twice is unlikely. This indicates that the planners knew that the working tapes would later be used by investigators as evidence of a hijacking.

The sources for the planes yields the following table:

Time	Location	Source	Event
:-	:-	:-	:-
9:28	25 mi. north-east of Youngstown	Radar Data*	Screams from Flight X (?)
9:31	Youngstown/Ohio	Radar Data*	First hijacker transmission from Flight X
9:39	Cleveland/Oberlin	Radar Data*	Last hijack transmission from Flight X
10:10	80 mi. north-west of D.C	9/11 Commission Report*	Flight X heading to Washington
10:18	50 mi. north-west of D.C	9/11 Commission Report	Flight X intercepted via fighters
10:45	Cleveland-Hopkins Airport	Article	Flight X forced to land

Notes
:-
Radar Data* This assumes that Flight X first flew in the radar shadow of Delta 1989, and then UA93 after the latter turned and climbed to 41,000 ft.
9/11 Commission Report* The report cites the TSD projected flight path data for United 93 as evidence of a "phantom plane", and hence as the target for the fighter intercept at ~10:18. This explanation has multiple problems.

FAA TSD data for U93 exists, but this is not necessarily the target for 10:12 intercept. You'd have to consider why FAA would forward projected flight path to Secret Service for the Vice-President to act on – sloppy. Possible plausible deniability?

~9:27 "Delta 89" presumably turns off its transponder

Possible no-transponder-plane 9:31-9:39 from Youngstown → Cleveland

9:41 – 9:44 – Delta 89 transponder (south of Cleveland Ohio!!) squawk code 7112:

“Planes taking part in NORAD exercises are assigned *discrete beacon codes* from DoD specified in FAAO 7610.4, Special Military Operations, Appendix 8.”

Citation: *FAAO 7110.65, Air Defense Exercise Beacon Code Assignment, Para 5–2–4*

NOTE: BOTH PLANES BEHAVED AS HIJACKED PLANES

9:27 – Boston FAA reports “Delta 89” as missing – reported by Alan Scott in interview
But Delta 1989 is never reported as missing or lost radio contact with ATC from any controllers.

Speculation: 9:38 – Flight X left radar cover of Delta 1989, became visible, vanished under UA93’s radar when the latter plane climbed. “Jarrah could not maintain level flight and hence climbed to 41,000 ft.” – 9/11 Commissioner’s Miles Kara’s blog, speculation?

~9:39 – Plane reported “downed” in Ohio: sources. Fuzzy, but explains location between 9:39 and 10:10.

~10:02 – Reports of inbound aircraft toward Washington

~10:08 – shoot-down order in effect

10:10 – 10:15 – “Plane was 80 miles out”

10:12 – 10:18 – Military aide returned, Dick Cheney asked for authorization to engage aircraft “50 miles out” – Flight X. Flight 93 tracked by Secret Service thru TSD – but why would the FAA forward misleading information to the Service in time of crisis? 9/11 report claims that FAA unaware of UA93 crash at 10:07.

“Phantom plane” is in fact real plane creating a radar blip which outlasted UA93 crash. At least one controller at Cleveland was aware that UA93 had crashed – unsure if this was communicated to others

~10:18 Flight X intercepted by fighters – sourced claim; Delta 1989 in contrast was never intercepted. This is a lone report, but it fits nicely with other (verified) primary reports. Lack of confirmation otherwise may indicate a terror drill requiring military secrecy.
--Evacuation of airport resembles a terror drill

Mineta’s Flight 77 statements contradicted by Secret Service timeline, White House memos, etc.